**REMARKS**

Claims 9-23 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of July 1, 2003, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The language of claims 9 and 10 are said to be ambiguous.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 9 and 10 have been rewritten to clarify that the galvanized alloy plated sheet is treated with an anodic treatment in acid solution in which the composition is the same as the bath composition of the plating bath forming the galvanized alloy. Support for this can be found in the specification as filed at page 3, first two paragraphs.

**Art Rejections**

Claims 9-12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saitou et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The surface of the galvanized alloy steel sheet of the present invention is blackened by **anodic electrolysis** as described in the Examples. The blackened layer of the present invention mainly contains a hydrate oxide of a galvanized alloy. The surface of a galvanized alloy steel sheet of Saitou et al. is blackened by **cathodes electrolysis**. This forms a different blacked substance on the steel sheet.

In the present invention, the bath composition for the anodic electrolysis is the same as the bath composition of the galvanized alloy plating bath. The Zn alloy electroplating and surface-blackened treatment of the present invention can be performed using one bath. In contrast thereto, the bath composition of Saitou et al. is not the same as the bath composition of the galvanized alloy plating bath, and the galvanized alloy plating bath cannot be used for a surface-blackening treatment. The bath composition of the present invention does not contain either an oxidizing ion or an organic hydroxyl compounds which are found in the surface-blackening bath of Saitou et al.

The specification at page 6, last full paragraph, stats that the layer of the composite includes at least one kind of hydrate oxide selected from Zn, Co, Ni and Mo to form the blackened surface. There is no indication in Saitou et al. that the blackened layer is at least one hydrate oxide of a

galvanized alloy. This composition is specifically claimed in newly submitted claims 22 and 23.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitou et al. in view of Smith et al. The Examiner concedes that Saitou et al. do not specifically disclose that their urethane resin has the claimed pencil hardness, tensile strength or extension ratio. Smith et al. are said to disclose an aqueous polyurethane dispersion having a higher modulus and that may be used to coat cold rolled steel plates and having an elongation of 290%, a tensile strength or 5800 psi, and a pencil hardness of 1 H.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. As noted above, the surface blackened steel sheet of the present invention is different from the steel sheet of Saitou et al. in that the blackened layer of the steel sheet is not the same by virtue of different methods and compositions for producing the blackened surface. Additionally, the resin coating of the present invention can be urethane resin or one of many other types of resin that has the specific hardness, elongation, etc. Smith et al. add nothing to Saitou et al. in the composition of the blackened coating, and therefore cannot be combined with Saitou et al. to render the present claims obvious.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaka et al. in view of Saitou et al. Ishizaka et al. are said to teach that film cartridges are made

of steel so that when a film cartridge is loaded into a film chamber it is attracted by eth permanent magnets. The Examiner admits that Ishizaka et al. do not teach that the steel film cartridge has the claimed galvanized alloy plating, blackened surface, or resin coating.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. As noted above, there is nothing in Saitou et al. that discloses or suggests the particular blackened coating formed by the process of the present invention. Ishizaka et al. add nothing to Saitou et al., as there is no disclosure of even a blackened coating as shown in Saitou et al.

It should be noted that the blackened coating of the present invention differs from that of Saitou et al. in that the bath used for the treatment differs from that of Saitou et al., thus producing a different blackened coating.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:zv
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\T\TOYO\Komai4\PTO\Amd25SEPT03.doc